

To: Mylott, Richard[Mylott.Richard@epa.gov]
From: Daguillard, Robert
Sent: Tue 8/11/2015 7:50:51 PM
Subject: RE: EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy on Gold King Mine Release

Thanks, man. It's a team effort.

Thanks also for the web site.

From: Mylott, Richard
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 3:49 PM
To: Daguillard, Robert
Subject: FW: EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy on Gold King Mine Release

Robert—sincerely appreciate your help with the larger SF/mining questions. This part of our website should help with the Animas specific Qs.

Rich

<http://www2.epa.gov/region8/upper-animas-mining-district>

From: Brown, Matthew [<mailto:MBrown@ap.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 1:42 PM
To: Daguillard, Robert; Valentine, Julia; Mylott, Richard; Smith, Paula; Gray, David; Zito, Kelly
Cc: Knickmeyer, Ellen; Moreno, Ivan; Anderson, Jim
Subject: RE: EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy on Gold King Mine Release

Thanks Robert. I appreciate you passing along the administrator's remarks and we've already incorporated some of them into our story.

However, the remarks did not address any of the questions we posed this morning. Can you please respond to these questions?:

--how many mines are currently on the National Priorities List? Can we get a list of those or is there a way to search on the Superfund website?

--does the EPA have any estimate on total number of abandoned mines? (in the western US and/or nationwide, or whatever is available) **GOT ANSWER FROM BLM**

--is there a gauge of how often resistance to a Superfund designation by local officials has prevented a site's listing?

-was a preliminary assessment ever completed on the Gold King Mine or for a group of mines including Gold King?

--it's my understanding that the EPA has said a water treatment plant estimated to cost \$12-\$17m (and \$1M a year to operate) would be able to clean the water in the Animas. Is that correct? And if so, is it the type of expense that Superfund would cover?

Also, adding this question:

Had Gold King Mine been designated a Superfund site, what would have been the chances of the spill happening?

Thanks, Robert.

Matt Brown

From: Daguillard, Robert [<mailto:Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 1:10 PM
To: Daguillard, Robert
Subject: EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy on Gold King Mine Release

Today, EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy spoke about the release of mining wastewater from the Gold King Mine, the agency's commitment to ensuring it's cleaned up and the health and safety residents. Below are her remarks.

I know we are here to talk about the Clean Power Plan, but I want to first spend a few minutes talking about the release of mining waste water in Colorado, that's impacting or could impact that state as well as New Mexico, Utah, the Navajo Nation and the Southern Ute Tribe.

This is a tragic and unfortunate incident, and EPA is taking responsibility to ensure that it is cleaned up. The most important thing throughout this is ensuring the health and safety of the residents and visitors near the river. We are committed to helping the people throughout the Four Corner Regions who rely on these rivers for their drinking water, irrigation water and recreation. We know how important it is to them.

As you may not know, there are thousands of abandoned mines throughout the West, and EPA routinely works with states to clean up these sites. The spill occurred when one of our contracting teams was using heavy equipment to enter the Gold King Mine, an inactive mine north of Durango, to begin the process of pumping and treating the contaminated water inside. In response to this unfortunate accident, we have deployed the full depth and breadth of the agency, with other partner agencies assisting.

It takes times to review and analyze data, but we have our researchers and scientists working around the clock. Our commitment is to get this right and protect public health. Thankfully, there have been no reported cases of anyone's health being harmed. Additionally, from initial sampling results, as the plume has advanced seeing elevated levels, and as it moves on, we are seeing a downward trajectory toward pre-event conditions.

EPA has taken steps to capture and treat the discharge at the Gold King mine, addressing the risk of additional downstream impacts. We have constructed four ponds at the mine site which are treating water by lowering acidity levels and removing dissolved metals.

We have also stood up a Unified Command center in Durango, as well as the Emergency Operations Center at EPA headquarters in DC to ensure a seamless coordinated response in conjunction with local, state and federal officials. Working with local officials, EPA is providing alternative water supplies and free water quality testing for domestic drinking water wells along the river. We have been in touch with the state leadership, as well as the Congressional delegations, and we have kept the White House informed.

EPA is an agency whose core mission is ensuring a clean environment and protecting public health, so it pains me to see this happening. But we are working tirelessly to respond and have committed to a full review of exactly what happened to ensure it cannot happen again.

So with that, let's move to the Clean Power Plan.

Robert Daguillard

Office of Media Relations

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)

+1 (202) 360-0476 (cel)

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at +1-212-621-1898 and delete this email. Thank you.

[IP_US_DISC]

msk dccc60c6d2c3a6438f0cf467d9a4938